



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/990,054	11/21/2001	Dean R. Dodge	1316N-001660	1466

27572 7590 03/24/2003

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. BOX 828
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

EXAMINER

BURCH, MELODY M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3683

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2003

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/990,054

Applicant(s)

DODGE ET AL.

Examiner

Melody M. Burch

Art Unit

3683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 December 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The proposed drawing correction and/or the proposed substitute sheets of drawings, filed on 12/20/02 have been disapproved because they introduce new matter into the drawings. 37 CFR 1.121(f) states that no amendment may introduce new matter into the disclosure of an application. The original disclosure does not support the showing of the use of the same first and second discs for both the piston and base valve assemblies. Examiner acknowledges that the originally filed disclosure provides support for a piston valve assembly including a first disc and a second disc supporting the first disc along a chordal edge as set forth in original claim 6, but there was never any indication that the first and second discs of the piston valve assembly were same discs used in the base valve assembly. Examiner recommends the use of different numbers. Such a modification would also require that the chordal edge of the second disc and the outer circular edges of the two discs of the piston valve assembly be clearly shown as claimed.

Specification

2. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The specification lacks proper antecedent basis for the term "pressure valve" claimed in line 2 of claim 5.

3. 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, requires the specification to be written in "full, clear, concise, and exact terms." The specification is replete with terms which are not

Art Unit: 3683

clear, concise and exact. The specification should be revised carefully in order to comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Examples of some unclear, inexact or verbose terms used in the specification are: the phrase "the deflection of the entire plurality of valve discs" is unclear. It is unclear which discs Applicant is referring to since there is a main valve disc, a clipped disc and a valve disc in the rebound valve assembly in the case of the base valve. Clarification is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The originally filed disclosure does not support the limitation of a mid/high speed valve comprising *only* first and second valve discs. Similar to the way in which the second disc provides support for the first disc during fluid flow, the unnumbered portion of bolt 66 shown in the area of element 96 provides support for the second disc during fluid flow and, therefore, could be considered to be a part of the mid/high speed valve. It is also noted that the use of the word "only" does not properly limit the claim language in light of the use of the open-ended transitional term "comprising" in the preamble of the claim.

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 3683

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Re: claim 1. Claim 1 recites the limitation "said single outer chordal edge" in 3 from the bottom. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

The remaining claims are indefinite due to their dependency from claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5042624 to Furuya et al. in view of US Patent 5529154 to Tanaka and US Patent 4964493 to Yamaura et al.

Re: claim 1. Furuya et al. show in figures 1 and 3 a damper comprising: a pressure tube 1 forming a working chamber 1a,1b; a reservoir tube 6 disposed around the pressure tube, the reservoir tube forming a reservoir chamber 7 between the pressure tube and the reservoir tube, a base valve assembly 4 disposed between the working chamber and the reservoir chamber for regulating flow of damping fluid in a first direction between the working chamber and the reservoir chamber, the base valve

Art Unit: 3683

assembly comprising: a valve body 4f defining a fluid passage 402,403; a first valve disc 4e disposed adjacent the valve body for closing the fluid passage, the first valve disc having an outside edge and a central axis; a second valve disc 4d disposed adjacent said first valve disc, the second valve disc having an outer edge supporting the first valve disc at a position between the outside edge and the central axis of the first valve disc, but does not specifically disclose that the outer edge of the second valve disc is chordal.

Tanaka teaches in figures 3a and 4a the use of a damper having a second valve disc 19 which is disposed adjacent to a first valve disc 17, the second valve disc having an outer edge 19a supporting the first valve disc at a position between the outside edge and a central axis of the first valve disc. Tanaka further teaches in col. 5 lines 46-51 that the damping force may be varied depending on the shape of valve disc 19 and the shape, angle, and depth of the outer edge 19a.

Yamaura et al. teach in figure 2 the use of a damper having a second valve disc 144 which is disposed adjacent to a first valve disc 138 via element 142, the second valve disc having an outer edge shown in the area of element number 158 supporting the first valve disc at a position between the outside edge and a central axis of the first valve disc (during large deflections of element 138). Yamaura et al. particularly teach in figure 4 the use of the outer edge of the second valve disc being a chordal edge as shown in the area of element number 162.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the outer edge of the second valve disc of Furuya

Art Unit: 3683

et al. to have included a chordal outer edge, in view of the teachings of Tanaka and Yamaura et al., in order to provide a pivot edge for the first valve disc to achieve a desired damping force as best determined by routine experimentation.

Re: claim 2. Furuya et al. show in figure 1 a piston 5 dividing the working chamber into an upper portion 1a and a lower portion 1b the base valve assembly being disposed between the lower portion of the working chamber and the reservoir chamber.

Re: claims 3 and 5. Furuya et al. show in figure 1 the base valve comprising a pressure valve 4h,4g regulating the damping fluid in a second direction.

Re: claim 4. Furuya et al. show in figures 1 and 3 a damper comprising: a pressure tube 1 forming a working chamber 1a,1b; a piston 5 disposed within the working chamber, the piston dividing the working chamber into an upper working 1a and a lower working chamber 1b; a reservoir tube 6 disposed around the pressure tube, the reservoir tube forming a reservoir chamber 7 between the pressure tube and the reservoir tube; a base valve 4 assembly disposed between the lower working chamber and the reservoir chamber for regulating flow of damping fluid in a first direction between the lower working chamber and the reservoir chamber, the base valve assembly comprising: a low speed valve movable between a closed position and an open position, the low speed valve including a first valve disc 4e having an outside edge and a central axis and a second valve disc 4d supporting the first valve disc along an edge at a position between the outside edge and the central axis of the first valve disc; and a mid/high speed valve movable between a closed position and an open position, the mid/high speed valve comprising the first and second valve disc as disclosed in the

Art Unit: 3683

first 9 lines of the abstract and in col. 6 lines 11-42 , but does not specifically disclose that the outer edge of the second valve disc is chordal.

Tanaka teaches in figures 3a and 4a the use of a damper having a second valve disc¹⁹ which is disposed adjacent to a first valve disc 17, the second valve disc having an outer edge 19a supporting the first valve disc at a position between the outside edge and a central axis of the first valve disc. Tanaka further teaches in col. 5 lines 46-51 that the damping force may be varied depending on the shape of valve disc 19 and the shape, angle, and depth of the outer edge 19a.

Yamaura et al. teach in figure 2 the use of a damper having a second valve disc 144 which is disposed adjacent to a first valve disc 138 via element 142, the second valve disc having an outer edge shown in the area of element number 158 supporting the first valve disc at a position between the outside edge and a central axis of the first valve disc (during large deflections of element 138). Yamaura et al. particularly teach in figure 4 the use of the outer edge of the second valve disc being a chordal edge as shown in the area of element number 162.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the outer edge of the second valve disc of Furuya et al. to have included a chordal outer edge, in view of the teachings of Tanaka and Yamaura et al., in order to provide a pivot edge for the first valve disc to achieve a desired damping force as best determined by routine experimentation.

10. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaura et al. in view of Tanaka. Yamaura et al. show in figures 1 and 2 a damper comprising: a

Art Unit: 3683

pressure tube 10 forming a working chamber 12, 14; a piston 102 disposed within the working chamber, the piston dividing the working chamber into an upper working chamber 12 and a lower working chamber 14; a piston valve assembly 100 attached to the piston for regulating flow of damping fluid between the upper working chamber and the lower working chamber, the piston valve assembly comprising: a low speed valve movable between a closed position and an open position, the low speed valve including a first valve disc 138 having an outside edge and a central axis and a second valve disc 144 supporting via element 142 the first valve disc along an edge at a position between the outside edge and the central axis of the first valve disc (during large deflections of element 138); and a mid/high speed valve movable between a closed position and an open position, the mid/high speed valve comprising the first and second valve disc as disclosed in col. 7 lines 40 – col. 9 line 10, but does not specifically disclose that the outer edge of the second valve disc is chordal.

Tanaka teaches in figures 3a and 4a the use of a damper having a second valve disc 19 which is disposed adjacent to a first valve disc 17, the second valve disc having an outer edge 19a supporting the first valve disc at a position between the outside edge and a central axis of the first valve disc. Tanaka further teaches in col. 5 lines 46-51 that the damping force may be varied depending on the shape of valve disc 19 and the shape, angle, and depth of the outer edge 19a.

Yamaura et al. teach in figure 2 the use of a damper having a second valve disc 144 which is disposed adjacent to a first valve disc 138 via element 142, the second valve disc having an outer edge shown in the area of element number 158 supporting

Art Unit: 3683

the first valve disc at a position between the outside edge and a central axis of the first valve disc (during large deflections of element 138). Yamaura et al. particularly teach in figure 4 the use of the outer edge of the second valve disc being a chordal edge as shown in the area of element number 162.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the outer edge of the second valve disc of Yamaura et al. to have included a chordal outer edge, in view of the teachings of Tanaka and Yamaura et al., in order to provide a pivot edge for the first valve disc to achieve a desired damping force as best determined by routine experimentation.

Double Patenting

11. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

12. Claims 1, 2, and 3 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, and 3 of copending Application No. 09/552125 in view of US Patent 5529154 to Tanaka and US Patent 4964493 to Yamaura et al.

Both applications claim the invention substantially as set forth above, but the instant invention is specific as to the chordal shape of a pivot edge created by the outer edge of the second valve disc.

Tanaka teaches in figures 3a and 4a the use of a damper having a second valve disc¹⁹ which is disposed adjacent to a first valve disc 17, the second valve disc having an outer edge 19a supporting the first valve disc at a position between the outside edge and a central axis of the first valve disc. Tanaka further teaches in col. 5 lines 46-51 that the damping force may be varied depending on the shape of valve disc 19 and the shape, angle, and depth of the outer edge 19a.

Yamaura et al. teach in figure 2 the use of a damper having a second valve disc 144 which is disposed adjacent to a first valve disc 138 via element 142, the second valve disc having an outer edge shown in the area of element number 158 supporting the first valve disc at a position between the outside edge and a central axis of the first valve disc (during large deflections of element 138). Yamaura et al. particularly teach in figure 4 the use of the outer edge of the second valve disc being a chordal edge as shown in the area of element number 162.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the outer edge of the second valve disc of Application no. 09/552125 to have included a chordal outer edge, in view of the teachings of Tanaka and Yamaura et al., in order to provide a pivot edge for the first valve disc to achieve a desired damping force as best determined by routine experimentation.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

13. Claims 4 and 5 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 8 and 9 of copending Application No. 09/552125 in view of Furuya et al. '624, US Patent 5529154 to Tanaka and US Patent 4964493 to Yamaura et al. Both applications claim the invention substantially as set forth above, but the instant invention is specific as to the chordal shape of a pivot edge created by the outer edge of the second valve disc.

Tanaka teaches in figures 3a and 4a the use of a damper having a second valve disc 19 which is disposed adjacent to a first valve disc 17, the second valve disc having an outer edge 19a supporting the first valve disc at a position between the outside edge and a central axis of the first valve disc. Tanaka further teaches in col. 5 lines 46-51 that the damping force may be varied depending on the shape of valve disc 19 and the shape, angle, and depth of the outer edge 19a.

Yamaura et al. teach in figure 2 the use of a damper having a second valve disc 144 which is disposed adjacent to a first valve disc 138 via element 142, the second valve disc having an outer edge shown in the area of element number 158 supporting the first valve disc at a position between the outside edge and a central axis of the first valve disc (during large deflections of element 138). Yamaura et al. particularly teach in figure 4 the use of the outer edge of the second valve disc being a chordal edge as shown in the area of element number 162.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the outer edge of the second valve disc of

Art Unit: 3683

Application no. 09/552125 to have included a chordal outer edge, in view of the teachings of Tanaka and Yamaura et al., in order to provide a pivot edge for the first valve disc to achieve a desired damping force as best determined by routine experimentation.

Also, Application no. 09/552125 claims the use of the mid/high valve including a third valve disc supporting the second valve disc. Furuya et al. teach in figures 1 and 3 the use of a damper having a mid/high speed valve including a third generally planar valve disc 4c supporting the second planar valve disc as disclosed in the abstract lines 1-9. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the mid/high speed valve of the instant application to have included a third valve disc, as taught by Furuya et al., in order to provide a means of supporting the second valve disc and to provide a means of assisting in second stage damping.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

14. Claim 6 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 14 of copending Application No. 09/552125 in view of Yamaura et al. in view of Tanaka. Both applications claim the invention substantially as set forth above, but the instant invention is specific as to the chordal shape of a pivot edge created by the outer edge of the second valve disc.

Tanaka teaches in figures 3a and 4a the use of a damper having a second valve disc¹⁹ which is disposed adjacent to a first valve disc 17, the second valve disc having

Art Unit: 3683

an outer edge 19a supporting the first valve disc at a position between the outside edge and a central axis of the first valve disc. Tanaka further teaches col. 5 lines 46-51 the damping force may be varied depending on the shape of valve disc 19 and the shape, angle, and depth of the outer edge 19a.

Yamaura et al. teach in figure 2 the use of a damper having a second valve disc 144 which is disposed adjacent to a first valve disc 138 via element 142, the second valve disc having an outer edge shown in the area of element number 158 supporting the first valve disc at a position between the outside edge and a central axis of the first valve disc (during large deflections of element 138). Yamaura et al. particularly teach in figure 4 the use of the outer edge of the second valve disc being a chordal edge as shown in the area of element number 162.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the outer edge of the second valve disc of Application no. 09/552125 to have included a chordal outer edge, in view of the teachings of Tanaka and Yamaura et al., in order to provide a pivot edge for the first valve disc to achieve a desired damping force as best determined by routine experimentation.

Also, Application no. 09/552125 claims the use of the mid/high valve including a third valve disc supporting the second valve disc. Yamarua et al. teach in figure 2 the use of a damper having a mid/high speed valve including a third generally planar valve disc 140 supporting the second planar valve disc. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the mid/high

Art Unit: 3683

speed valve of the instant application to have included a third valve disc, as taught by Yamaura et al., in order to provide a means of supporting the second valve disc and to provide a means of assisting in second stage damping.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Response to Arguments

15. The arguments filed 12/20/02 have been considered but are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the second valve disc 4d of Furuya et al. is not adjacent the valve disc of disc valve 4e that is adjacent body 4f. Examiner reiterates that the first valve disc is represented by 4e in its entirety and that element 4e is disposed adjacent the valve body 4f, and a second valve disc 4d is disposed adjacent the first valve disc as shown in figure 3. Applicant also argues that the claims have been amended to define the second valve disc having an outer edge defined by an outer circular edge truncated only by a single outer chordal edge. Examiner notes that in the preamble of the claims Applicant utilizes the transitional term "comprising" which is open-ended, therefore, allowing the presence of other components. Examiner also notes that Tanaka teaches in col. 5 lines 48-50 that, among other features, the number of clipped portions on a valve disc may be varied. Accordingly, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the number of clipped portions on the valve disc of Furuya et al. to have included one or any other appropriate number or clipped portions as best determined by routine experimentation, in view of the teachings of Tanaka, in order to provide a means of achieving a desired damping force generation depending on the damper applications and manufacturing

Art Unit: 3683

requirements. It is also noted that Tanaka teaches in figures 3a and 4a the use of circular outer edges. In *In re Dailey*, 357 F.2d 669, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966) the court held that the configuration of a claimed object was a matter of choice which a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found obvious absent persuasive evidence that the particular configuration was significant. Since Applicant failed to describe the criticality associated with circular outer edges and since the outer edges of the valve discs of Furuya et al., as modified, function equally as well, it is maintained that a change in the configuration of the outer edge would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the valve art. Finally, in response to the double patenting rejections, Applicant argues that unlike the other application claims, the claims of the instant invention include the chordal edge limitation. Examiner notes that an obviousness-type double patenting rejection was set forth in which a secondary reference was used to teach the chordal edge limitation.

Conclusion

16. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 3683


the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melody M. Burch whose telephone number is 703-306-4618. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:30 AM-4:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Lavinder can be reached on 703-308-3421. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-7687 for regular communications and 703-305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

mmb 3/13/03
mmb
March 13, 2003


3-18-2003
MATTHEW C. GRAHAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 310